Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed August 9, 2006, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 19-21 have been amended. The claims have been amended to clarify that a request to provide a notification in response to the occurrence of an event includes at least one hyperlink to additional data regarding the event, data for customizing a visual indication that the event has occurred, the visual indication comprising a user name and to clarify that based on a selection of a hyperlink on a client computer, the computer is operative to place an order for purchasing a product with a billing server computer. Support for these amendments may be found in Figure 4 and on page 7, lines 5-20 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooperman et al ("Cooperman", US 6,907,447) in view of Burg et al ("Burg", US 6,362,840). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooperman in view of Capps (US 2002/0111813).

Applicants' Statement of the Substance of the Interview

A telephonic interview between the undersigned representative for the Applicants and the Examiner was held on November 6, 2006 to discuss a proposed claim amendment to address the rejection of independent claims 19-21 in view of the cited references of record. In the interview, the Examiner agreed with the Applicants' representative that the cited references do not disclose that a request to provide a notification in response to the occurrence of an event includes at least one hyperlink to additional data regarding the event, data for customizing a visual indication that the event has occurred, the visual indication comprising a user name or selecting a hyperlink and, based on the selection,

placing an order for purchasing a product with a billing server computer, as specified in the proposed claim amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

<u>Claims 19 and 21</u>

Claims 19 and 21 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cooperman in view of Burg. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 19 specifies a system for providing a notification that an event has occurred. The system includes a client computer comprising an output device, a memory, a central processing unit, and a storage device containing computer-readable instructions for execution on the central processing unit, the computer-readable instructions operative to cause the client computer to transmit a request to provide a notification in response to the occurrence of the event to each of a plurality of a server computers, the request comprising a description of the event corresponding to the server computer, at least one hyperlink to additional data regarding the event, data for customizing a visual indication that the event has occurred, the visual indication comprising a user name, and a user identifier, to receive from each of the server computers a request to provide a notification that the event has occurred and to open a new user interface window for each request that is received to thereby display each notification, each notification comprising a description of the event, wherein the event is a user-specified event; a plurality of server computers each comprising a memory, a central processing unit, and a storage device containing computer-readable instructions for execution on the central processing unit of the server computer, the computer-readable instructions operative to cause the server computer to receive the request to

6

provide a notification from the client computer, to determine whether the event has occurred, to identify a network address for the client computer based on the user identifier in response to determining that the event has occurred, wherein the network address is an Internet protocol address, and to transmit the request to the client computer to provide a notification that the event has occurred at the network address; and a billing server computer, and wherein at least one of the notifications that one of the events has occurred further comprises a hyperlink, and wherein the client computer is further operative to receive a selection of the hyperlink and, based on the selection, to place an order for purchasing a product with the billing server computer.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Cooperman and Burg fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 19. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose that a request to provide a notification in response to the occurrence of an event includes at least one hyperlink to additional data regarding the event, data for customizing a visual indication that the event has occurred, the visual indication comprising a user name and fails to disclose that based on a selection of a hyperlink on a client computer, the computer is operative to place an order for purchasing a product with a billing server computer.

Cooperman discusses providing an instant message notification for branded messages received from a business partner. The messages may include stock quotes, product specials, or other information from the business partner. A user may change the conditions upon which the instant messages are transmitted by the business partner to the user. The instant message may contain a branded message from a business partner including a shipping company logo. Cooperman also discusses providing a hyperlink in a

branded message which, when selected, directs a Web browser to an Internet Web site provided by the business partner. See col. 3, lines 12-42.

Cooperman, however, fails to disclose that a request for an event notification includes a hyperlink to additional data regarding the event or data for customizing a visual indication that the event has occurred (as discussed above, Cooperman only discusses the use of hyperlinks in an instant message transmitted to a user). Furthermore, Cooperman, which discusses branded messages including a company logo, fails to disclose customizing a visual indication that an event has occurred with the user's name. Furthermore, Cooperman only discusses the use of hyperlinks for directing a browser to a website provided by a business partner and thus fails to disclose selecting a hyperlink to make a product purchase on a billing server computer.

Burg, relied upon to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Cooperman, discusses creating computer graphic displays having a link area, which when selected, may present a telephone icon for linking to a communication service (e.g., a telephone service) or a financial service (see col. 1, lines 47-56 and col. 11, lines 40-67). Burg however, like Cooperman, fails to disclose that a request for an event notification includes a hyperlink to additional data regarding the event, data for customizing a visual indication that the event has occurred, customizing the visual indication with the user's name, or selecting a hyperlink to make a product purchase on a billing server computer, as specified in amended claim 19.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, amended independent claim 19 is allowable over Cooperman in view of Burg and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Amended independent claim 21 recites similar features as amended independent claim 19

and thus is also allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of this claim should also be withdrawn.

<u>Claim 20</u>

Claim 20 is rejected as being unpatentable over Cooperman in view of Capps. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed. Amended independent claim 20 recites similar features as amended independent claim 19 (discussed above) and thus is allowable over Cooperman for at least the same reasons.

Capps, relied upon to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Cooperman, discusses a computer system for automatically identifying persons and providing relative information by parsing electronic documents to identify a person, retrieving data relevant to the identified person from a database, and notifying a user that the person has been identified (via a visual alert such as an icon or other graphical indicator added to the parsed electronic document) and that the relevant data is available. The visual alert may act as a link or hyperlink to the relevant data (see paragraphs 0009-0010 and 0017-0018). However, Capps fails to teach, disclose, or suggest that a request for an event notification includes a hyperlink (Capps only discusses that the actual notification may include a hyperlink) to additional data regarding the event or data for customizing a visual indication that the event has occurred, where the customized visual indication is the user's name. Based on the foregoing, amended independent claim 20 is allowable over Cooperman in view of Capps and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 9, 2006

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(678) 565-4748